

28 February 1968

IRAG Meeting Notes #5

1. The fifth meeting of the Information Requirements Advisory Group (IRAG) on 19 February 1968 was chaired by Proctor (A/DDI). Attending were Lauderdale (A/DDS&T), [REDACTED] Brandwein (FMSAC), [REDACTED] Jenne (IRS), [REDACTED]

25X1A  
25X1A  
25X1A

2. The IRS member briefed the Group on the results of the validation trial from 1 November 1967 to 31 January 1968. A copy of the briefing outline is attached. The members discussed briefly several of the major findings regarding the validation criteria and their application to requirements and evaluations.

3. The Chairman discussed the forthcoming reductions in the numbers of overseas personnel, in terms of the impact of these cuts on the flow of reporting now received on a routine basis. He noted that the Chief, FI Staff, DDP, is the CIA representative to the Department of State Phase IV program.

4. The Chairman announced that the Group will meet again at 1530, 8 March 1968 in Room 7E44, Headquarters. The purposes of the meeting are to:

a. Examine the office findings concerning the results of the validation trial, with particular attention to validation criteria 3 and 4.

b. Consider the IRS suggestion that all future sub-standard requirements be examined by the Chief, IRS, and the IRAG member of the originating office, with the appropriate collector attending when necessary.

c. Establish the final procedures and criteria for use in the human source requirements and evaluation process.

[REDACTED]  
Herbert J. Jenne  
Ext. 1112(r)

25X1A

SECRET

## IRAG TRIAL

### OBJECTIVES

#### Procedures

- Involve management directly (Division Chief)
- Provide management with complete and orderly records

#### Criteria

- Improve quality of guidance content
- Ultimately -- influence collector reporting to fit greatest needs

SECRET

SECRET

## TRIAL RESULTS

### INVOLVE MANAGEMENT

- Most Division Chiefs **are now signing off**
- *few cases of delegating responsibility*

### MANAGEMENT RECORDS

- Suggest provision for hard copy record of validation

SECRET

**S E C R E T**

**QUALITY OF CONTENT**

**(144 FORMAL REQUIREMENTS)**

- Assessment against 10 criteria  
(very subjective!)
- 75% reasonable good  
25% submarginal

**S E C R E T**

SECRET

APPLICATION OF CRITERIA

- Results are based on reasonable application of intent of criteria
- Criteria Nos. 3 and 4 were not strictly applied
- Strict application Nos. 3 and 4 would have increased submarginal to between 50% and 70%

SECRET

SECRET

NOS. 3 AND 4 PROBLEM

INTENT:

- Information requested must add to or change major intelligence position or publication
- Information requested must be new, significant and limited to essentials

SECRET

SECRET

POSSIBLE 3 AND 4 PROBLEM FACTORS

- Not all analyst substantive responsibilities are of "critical" concern
- Human source reporting generally tends toward "subcritical" -- except some crisis situations
- Bits and pieces of information requested are not readily identifiable with major intelligence positions
- Analyst requires background knowledge
  - No direct use in product
  - But indirect use in analyzing other data and balancing judgments
- Evaluation profile reflects analyst views

SECRET

**S E C R E T**

- **Evaluation Profile**
  - **322 evaluations were completed during period**
  - **94% ask for or encourage more reports**
  - **(6%) say no more, thank you**
- **Therefore, criteria Nos. 3 and 4 may need reconsideration**

**S E C R E T**



**SECRET**

**REQUIREMENTS PROFILE**

- = 144 were processed during trial**
- = A slight decrease from the same period last year**
- = 33% of requirements responded to notices of intelligence potential (NIPS)**
  - Over half of these to DCS**
  - Of 305 NIPS DCS issued 133**
- = 23% of requirements processed originated as a follow up to collector reports**
- = Therefore, 56% of all requirements are reaction to announced collector capability**

**SECRET**

**S E C R E T**

- Originator distribution pattern similar to Cunningham Survey
- 50% of all requirements were originated by OSI
  - 65% of these to DCS
- 25% of all requirements were originated by one OSI Division (PSED)
  - 70% of these to DCS
- Other offices' requirements range from 3% to 21% of total processed
- There was no significant collector preference

**S E C R E T**

**S E C R E T**

**SUBMARGINAL REQUIREMENTS PROFILE**

- = 35 (or 25%) out of a total of 144**
- = 11 (or 31%) of these originated by PSED of OSI**
- = Of these 11 PSED requirements:**
  - 8 were responsive to DCS NIPS**
  - 2 more were follow up to reporting**
- = Other office submarginals ranged from 3% to 11%**
  - There was no significant collector pattern**

**S E C R E T**

**S E C R E T**

- Findings as indicators rather than conclusions

- Sample too small

**Suggest:**

- Continue the validation exercise

- IRS to assess each requirement as processed

- Schedule periodic discussion with appropriate IRAG member regarding IRS judgments on submarginals

- Include collector in discussions for cases where NIPS and reports are basic to requirement

- Continue to accumulate data

**S E C R E T**